

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Danny Thompson,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No. 8:11-2088-TLW-JDA
	)	
Ofc. Finkly; Sgt. Price; Investigator Greer;	)	
Ms. James; Mr. Oberman,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

**ORDER**

On August 11, 2011, the Plaintiff, Danny Thompson (“Plaintiff”), proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action. (Doc. # 1).

The matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin to whom this case had previously been assigned. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that Plaintiff’s complaint be dismissed for failure to prosecute pursuant to Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (Doc. # 59). Objections were due by March 29, 2012. Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Report. It is proper to conclude that Plaintiff has abandoned this action.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case. In addition to reviewing the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court has reviewed the complaint and the Motion for Summary Judgment filed by the Defendants. The Court finds the position set forth by the Defendants in their memorandum in support of the Motion for Summary Judgment to be persuasive in light of the record before the Court.

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 59). The Plaintiff's complaint is thereby **DISMISSED**. The Plaintiff's prior motion to receive legal materials is **DENIED**. (Doc. # 24). The Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, in light of the analysis herein, is terminated as moot. (Doc. # 35).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

April 2, 2012  
Florence, South Carolina